

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is requested. Claims 6 and 8 have been amended in order to more particularly point out and distinctly claim that which applicants regard as their invention (claim 6) and to respond to a specific objection directed to claim 8.

In more detail, claim 6 has been amended to specify that the rotogravure coated paper produced by the process results in a product that has a sheet gloss of 70% or more and a density of 1.10 g/cm^3 or less. Basis for these values appear throughout the description of the invention and in particular page 4, lines 6-9.

Responding to the examiner's comment directed to claim 8, the amorphous silicate is present in the base paper and this is consistent with the description of the invention and in particular page 7, lines 14-17 of the specification.

The amendments to claim 6 provide two significant features to the claim, namely sheet gloss stated as a minimum value of 70% or more and a density stated as a maximum value of 1.10 g/cm^3 or less. These features are not found in a single one of the references applied as prior art but can only be derived, if at all, by ignoring the types of materials being compared, much like the proverbial comparing apples with oranges. One skilled in the art would only compare like versus like and not shop around for a convenient value or property in one paper type and propose to apply it to a different type of paper.

The Official Action includes three separate prior art-based rejections, items 4, 15 and 24. Applicants have carefully studied the examiner's comments but believe that the claims as above amended define a process that is distinct from and patentable over the disclosures of the various references combined in the current Official Action. For instance, the rejection in item 4 includes four prior art references as does the rejection in item 15 whereas the rejection in item 24 contains five prior art references.

As explained above, each of these rejections is deficient as it does not meet the requirements of amended claim 6. For instance, the primary reference Kai discloses a sheet gloss of more than 70% but not a density of 1.10 g/cm^3 or less. More specifically, the density described in Table 2 of Kai is $1.20\text{-}1.13 \text{ g/cm}^3$ which is in excess of applicants' claimed maximum.

Similarly, Matsumura discloses a sheet gloss of more than 70% but again does not disclose a density of 1.10 g/cm^3 or less, defects also found in Kai as noted above.

On the other hand, while it is true that Ryu does describe a density of less than 1.10 g/cm^3 , it does not disclose a sheet gloss of more than 70% as discussed in the response of February 8, 2008 to the previous Official Action, Ryu is directed to an uncoated paper having a pigment-free coating layer formed on the paper. Clearly, Ryu is based upon a different type of paper and therefore constitutes an invention different from the present invention in at least paper type. Applicants submit that it is inappropriate to combine Kai with Ryu since Kai, which is the same type of paper used in the present invention, is completely different from Ryu who uses a different type of paper.

The Shay reference is of no particular relevance as it does not disclose either sheet gloss or density, features now added to claim 6.


A detailed discussion of each of the applied references is believed to be unnecessary as they share defects, each in its own way, and are not particularly relevant to the claims as above amended.

For the above reasons it is respectfully submitted that claims 6 and 8 define inventive subject matter and are based upon disclosure contained in the application as originally filed.

Reconsideration and favorable action are solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 
Arthur R. Crawford
Reg. No. 25,327

ARC:eaw
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100